

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-11, 13-28, 30-38, and 40-55 were pending and presented for examination. In an Office Action dated June 4, 2007, claims 1, 3-11, 13-28, 30-38, and 40-55 were rejected. Applicants thank the Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and address the Examiner's comments below.

In view of the Remarks that follow, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

Response to Claim Objections

In the 3rd paragraph of the Office Action, the Examiner has objected to claims 1, 28, and 55 because the claims use the phrase "second level related event object" without using the phrase "first level related event object."

Applicants respectfully submit that the recitation of a "second level related event object" is proper. The claim uses this term in a manner consistent with the Specification, which refers to first level event objects as "related event objects" and distinguishes those objects from "second level related event objects." (See, e.g., Specification paragraph 0037: "A second level related events object can also be used to associate related events objects.") Further, claim 1 by its own language makes clear the relationship between the second level related event objects and the related event objects that they comprise. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the recited phrase "second level related event object" is proper even though the claims do not use the phrase "first level related event object."

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC § 112, Paragraph 1

In the 4th paragraph of the Office Action, Examiner has rejected claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1 as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement due to the use of the word “tangible.”

Although not agreeing that the use of the word “tangible” fails to comply with § 112, in the interests of advancing prosecution Applicants have amended claim 28 to remove the phrase “tangible computer-readable medium” and to instead recite a “computer-readable storage medium,” and thus respectfully submit that claim 28 complies with § 112, ¶ 1.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 102(e) in View of Vleet

In the 5th paragraph of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3-8, 11, 13, 14, 16-22, 28, 30-35, 38, 40-41, 43-49 and 55 under 35 USC § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Vleet, U.S. Application Number 2005/0033803. This rejection is traversed.

Independent claims 1, 28, and 55 recite, in part, “creating a second level related event object comprising the related event object and a set of one or more other related event objects.” Second level event objects associate related events objects, which in turn associate events. (Specification paragraphs 0037, 0006) Thus, for example, if the article is a web site, the claimed invention beneficially provides the ability to identify an additional level of event relationships, such as not only identifying the relationship of events associated with a single web page, but additionally identifying the relationship of events occurring across each web page of a web site. (Specification paragraph 0040). This extra information allows more efficient and precise retrieval and analysis of event information.

In contrast, Vleet, which focuses on storing individual events and allowing later querying of those individual events, fails to disclose tracking event relationships via second level event objects. Cited paragraph 0027 of Vleet, sentence 1, discloses that event data captured by the Vleet event history server reflects actions performed by users during browsing of a particular web site or set of web sites hosted by the web site system. However, this portion merely states that the *scope* of event capture is usually limited to those events arising from user interactions with the website or set of websites being monitored by the Vleet event capture system, as opposed, for example, to “external” web sites as noted in sentences 2 and 3. However, this paragraph reveals nothing about how event objects are used to represent event relationships, such as by creating a second level related event objects comprising a related event object and a set of one or more other related event objects and associating the various related event objects, as claimed. Thus, Vleet paragraph 0027 does not reveal such a relationship of primary and secondary related event objects, but rather merely states the source of the events that are captured, with no disclosure of how event objects are used to relate them together.

Further, Vleet paragraph 0028, as noted cited in response to the Office Action of December 14th, 2006, merely shows retrieving event objects for the last 50 queries or the last 50 browse nodes, but fails to disclose second level event objects associating first level event objects, which in turn associate events. Thus, Vleet fails to anticipate claims 1, 28, and 55 for at least this reason.

Claims 2-8, 11-14, 16-22, 29-35, 38-41, and 43-49 depend from claims 1 and 28 and recite additional features and limitations. Thus, they are patentably distinguishable over Vleet for at least the same reasons set forth above.

**Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a) in View of
Vleet, Belfiore, Hrabik, and Maxham**

In the 6th to 8th paragraphs of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 9-10, 15, 36-37, and 42 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Vleet in view of Belfiore (U.S. Patent Application 2002/0059425). The Examiner additionally rejects claims 23-25 and 50-52 over Vleet in view of Hrabik (U.S. Patent Application 2002/0178383), and claims 26-27 and 53-54 over Vleet in view of Hrabik and Maxham (U.S. Patent Application 2004/0187075). Applicants respectfully submit that Belfiore, Hrabik, and Maxham do not remedy the deficiencies of Vleet for the reasons described in the response to the Office Action of December 14, 2006.

Based on the above amendment and the remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that for at least these reasons claims 1, 3-11, 13-28, 30-38, and 40-55 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejections, and withdraw them.

Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if the Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
STEPHEN R. LAWRENCE AND OMAR
HABIB KHAN

Date: July 23, 2007

By: /Brian Hoffman/

Brian M. Hoffman, Attorney of Record
Registration No. 39,713
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7607
Fax: (650) 938-5200